DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 234 CG 012 988

AUTHOR Linder, Steven
TITLE Synthesizing Humanism and Behaviorism.
PUB DATE [77]
NOTE 13p.; For related document see ED 110 063

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Change; *Behavior Theories; *Humanism; *Humanistic Education; Individualism; *Philosophy; *Professional Personnel; State of the Art Reviews; Synthesis

ABSTRACT

The old argument of humanism versus behaviorism is slowly being replaced by a synthesis of these two foundations of thought. This slow professional recognition of synthesis is due to three basic shortcomings in the professional community rather than extreme differences in ideological thought. They are: (1) psychological terminology being equated with a specific foundation of thought; (2) lack of emphasis in developing bonds of similarity rather than contradiction when setting goals and encounters for professional development; and (3) lack of mutual professional recognition between humanists and behaviorists. It is suggested that the phrase "humanistic behaviorism" be applied more in the professional community, and interpreted as the practitioner's use of behavioral techniques and tools to reach humanistic goals. New directions in research for humanism-behaviorism are also mentioned, including the examination of the influence of humanistic and behavioral variables on communication, problem-solving, therapeutic, and learning outcomes. (Author/KA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S Linder

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED162234

Synthesizing Humanism and Behaviorism

Steven Linder
Dept. of Humanistic and Behavioral Studies
Boston University

The old argument of humanism vs. behaviorism is slowly being replaced be a synthesis of these two foundations of thought. Actually, this synthesis is not all that new, even though slowly gaining popularity in the published professional community. As a humanist behaviorist, the author himself wrote many articles and books (Linder,1973,1974,1975,1976) expressing such a synthesis. Ellis' Rational Emotive Therapy (1973), Dustin's and George's Action Counseling (1973), and Woody's Psychobehavioral Counseling (1971) are all examples of how helping professionals are synthesizing humanism-behaviorism to increase their own effectiveness.

Milhollan and Forisha (1972) raised an interesting question when discussing behaviorism and phenomenology: Is man an object or subject? By object, the authors were referring to behaviorism, while phenomenology was subject in nature. This question today is not only exhausted but outdated. In the battle between humanism and behaviorism, the professional community had gained little insight. To answer the above question, man is both object and subject. Man is object of his environment and subject of his self.

The contradiction that seems to exist between behaviorists and humanists, brought into a right frame of reference, need not even exist, since humanism is a philosophy while behaviorism is a tool or technology (Fitt,1976; Hunter,1977). Such humanistic phrases as a "respect for individual worth", a "right to change one's fate", "to be an independent growing decission maker", "to be proactive rather than reactive to the environment", "to be a productive member of a group or society", and "to take-on an interest in the welfare of others" all reflect goals. Behaviorism is a way to achieve these goals by understanding the principles of reinforcement (positive reinforcement, negative reinforcement, extinction, schedule of reinforcement). Cohen and Hersh (1972) observed that

CG 012 988

where humanists have been strong (goal directed and rationales), behaviorists have been weak, and where the behaviorists have been strong (goal attainment-measurable; evaluation techniques), the humanists have been weak. Thus, Hunter (1977) postulated that one does not choose to use behavioristic principles, rather one is using them. Since humanism and behaviorism focuses on goals and the means to achieve goals respectively, the applications of these two approaches do not conflict. By synthesizing, both humanists and behaviorists can gain rather than loose valuable insight into the nature of man. Conflict over humanist and behavioral thoughts can be compromised to aid the growth of the client. Isn't this what the helping profession is all about?

The premise of this paper is to show that the slow professional recognition of a humanism-behaviorism synthesis is due to three basic shortcommings in the professional community, rather than the extreme differences in ideological thought. They are:

1. Psychological terminology being equated to a specific foundation of thought.
2. Lack of emphasis in developing bonds of simularity rather than contradiction when setting goals and encounters for professional development.
3. Lack of mutual professional recognition between humanists and behaviorists.

Shortcoming #1: Psychological terminology being equated to a specific foundation of thought.

Many professionals mistakenly characterized and credit popular terminology to a specific foundation of thought Modeling, a term accepted by behaviorists as their own is definately humanistic due to it's most basic characteristic of wholeness/gestalt. But because of it's popularity with behaviorists, many professionals mistakenly associate modeling with behaviorism.

Self-concepts, a psychological phrase popularized by humanists, can also take on a behavioral meaning:

1. Humanistic interpretation: Before an individual can learn, he must first develop positive self-attitudes. Thus, positive self-attitude individuals will develop self-competencies.
2. Behavioral interpretation: Self-concept is directly related to one's level of competence. Thus, competent individuals will develop positive attitudes.

Another term greatly popularized by behaviorists is accountability. Basically, "accountability" is the ability to count or keep scores. Frymier (1972) describes accountability as the political shibboleth of organizational responsibility. Behavioral Objectives, Management-By-Objectives, Planning-Programming-Budgeting-Systems, Program Evaluation Review Techniques, etc. are all means for developing within an organization (i.e., schools, corporations) the capacity of maintaining score/data results of a study, program, or individual/group profile. Management-By-Objectives (Odiorne,1965) is no more than a joint decision making process which identifies common organizational goals, defines each participant's responsibility, and projects expected results by using measurements and accessing each participant's contribution in the task team.

On the other hand, humanists do not believe that mere numbers alone posess the capability to reveal learning or other behavior results. Steller (1976,p.22) pointed out that the "...happy glow on the faces of caring, thinking children who love learning is the true evaluation." When one tries to measure organizational structures and processes, quantitative evidence and analysis can be easily obtained. However, this is not always true when unobservable humanistic qualities of behavior are studied.

According to Combs (1973), humanistic objectives are largely holistic, are concerned with affective aspects of learning, and deal largely with those qualities that make us human. Since humanistic objectives are involve in human matters of personal meaning, many of the observable behavioral techniques can not be used. Meanings, unlike behavioral objectives, are only internal

and are not open to direct/external investigations.

However, there are some humanistic traits that can be put into behavioral observable terminology. Weaver (1973) coined the phrase "affective behavioral objectives" to describe many humanistic terms (i.e., creativity, self-concepts) in behavioral objectives. To sum up the humorist-behavioral viewpoint, Haynes (1973,p.10) wrote the following:

> "In the same way, education must be allowed to embrace both the observable goal-specified behaviors required by accountability and the awareness which arise from metaphoric (closely related to creative insight) perceptions, which while they must be expressed through observable, measurable behaviors, are not identifiable with it."

Individualized instruction is another phrase that is popularized by behaviorists, but can also have humanistic meaning (Linder, 1974; __,1976). Humanists are critical of programmed instruction and other simular programs since it limits the respondent from going beyond the so called "required" answer. By producing robot-like answers, the humanists are afraid that individuals will loose interest in learning. Remembering that instructional design is only one aspect of constructing a humanistic learning climate, other variables such as student and teacher participation must also be considered (Linder,1976). Thus this behavioristic tool once again is at the mercy of humanistic goals.

Shortcoming #2: Lack of emphasis in developing bonds of simularity rather than contradiction when setting goals and encounters for professional development.

In the exhaustive battle between humanists and behaviorists, there have developed many misconceptions about both approaches (Dolly,1975; Hellison and Siedentop,1974). These misconceptions developed because of overcontradiction of behavioral and humanistic principles:

1. Behavioral approaches were designed for dealing with deviant behaviors.
   NOT TRUE: The primary goal of any behavioral program is to improve and change behavior. Deviant behaviors are only a small part of vast problems behaviorists challenge in their practice. The materialistic rewards used in many neuropsychiatric clinics (i.e., food, token economy) only represent the lowest possible reinforcement meaningful to the client and in no way represents the higher order reinforcements that can be used in the norm population.
2. Behaviorists can predict behavior with some degree of accuracy.
   NOT TRUE: As Rogers (Rogers and Skinner,1956,p.1063) stated, "In client-centered therapy, we are deeply engaged in the prediction and influencing of behavior, or even the control of behavior. As therapists we institute certain attitudinal conditions, and the client has relatively little voice in the establishment of these conditions. We predict that if these conditions are instituted, certain behavioral consequences will ensue in the client. Up to this point this is largely external control, no different from what Skinner has described."
3. Humanists view problem-solving as a simple behavior that can be taught to children.
   NOT TRUE: Humanists believe that children are capable of learning higher-order complex behaviors when taught in an atmosphere that supports such learning practices.
4. Behaviorism denies individuals of personal responsibility.
   NOT TRUE: When a child misbehaves, the behaviorist does not immediately change the provoking environment, but rather begins to modify the behavior pattern of the individual - a set plan that supports personal

responsibility.

5. Behaviorists deny individuals of feelings, private behavior, and mental events.
   NOT TRUE: "Man is said to differ from other animals mainly because he is aware of his own existance... he reflects on his own nature...he...knows thyself" (Skinner, 1971, p.190).
6. Behaviorists have a tendency to dehumanize man.
   NOT TRUE: According to Skinner (1972,p.19), "I would define a humanist as one who, because of the environment to which he has been exposed, is concerned for the future of mankind." It should be noted that B.F. Skinner was a recipient of the Humanist of the Year Award for 1972.
7. Humanists produce a set of artificial relationships when dealing with individuals.
   Behaviorists try to control the individual's environment during a helping relationship.
   NOT TRUE: Both humanists and behaviorists deal with controlled environment relationships. A behavior modification program is no more or less artificial than encounter groups. Also, humanistic techniques used poorly are no better nor worse than behavioral techniques used poorly.
8. Behaviorists delimit an individual's choice and freedom.
   NOT TRUE: Behaviorists do not limit an individual's choice and freedom no more than humanists do. In fact, MacCorquodale (1973) argues that it is really the humanists that tries to control environmental variables that affects an individual's behavior in order for them to choose more intelligently and live less miserably.

Shortcoming #3: Lack of mutual professional recognition between humanists and behaviorists.

Humanists and behaviorists seem to have a tendency to put-down, overgeneralize, or stereotype each other's foundations of thought (Steller,1976; Hunter,1977). Behaviorists characterized humanists as wild-eyed, blue jeaned, mushy thinkers, overly permissive revolutionaries who have an overall attitude of "doing your own thing." Humanists, on the other hand, labeled behaviorists as overly structured, rigid, manipulators who have an overall attitude of controlling humans, returning to the basics, and at the very least, put all aims/goals in behavioral objectives. Behaviorists are also viewed by humanists as having the attitude that school learning is hard work, while behaviorists perceive humanists as having the attitude that school learning is all fun (Dolly,1975).

All of these stereotypes, overgeneralizations and put-downs are all examples of how humanists and behaviorists placed communication barriers between themselves. Humanists labeling behaviorists rat-lovers or animal trainers, and behaviorists labeling humanists simple minded theorists in no way helped both their common cause - helping the client! Vast generalizations that puts down a philosophy of thought and action should not be encouraged, allowed and tolerated by any professional community: Professional Growth Begins In Practice!

Actually, when Carl Rogers departed from the traditional view of therapy and declared certain conditions necessary and sufficient (counselor's positive regard, empathy and geniuneness) to produce client change, he did not perceive behaviorists accepting his views. Today, many behaviorists strongly consider this therapeutic condition(s) as an important part of the counseling relationship (Klein,et.al.,1967; Hosford and Zimmer,1972).

In the same spirit of acceptance, when B.F. Skinner proposed that many behaviors were learned and that learning/psychological-

research-based techniques must be used, he did not expect that his major opponents, the humanists, would be accepting these ideas and using some of the behavioral techniques (Carkhuff and Berenson,1967).

It is futile to argue that there are major differences between humanism and behaviorism. Of course there are! On the other hand, no psychological theory should be so remote from other theories to disregard the primal function of psychology: the helping of others.

A worthwhile humanist-behavioral teacher training program should take into consideration the teaching skills necessary in dealing with students' behaviors and feelings inside, as well as outside, the classroom (Brownlee and King,1975). Behavior modification and other behavioral techniques emphasizes the shaping of behaviors by using external rewards, weakening undesirable behavior, and strengthening desirable behavior. Humanistic techniques focus on both, the external stimuli as well as the internal drives. For teachers to adequately deal with students, they need to be both humanistic as well as behavioristic. They must be able to give students positive reinforcement, as well as deal with feelings, self-concepts and values.

Concluding Comment: A Change In Research Direction.

For those who synthesize humanism-behaviorism, there are new challenges open to us in research. We can examine the influence of humanistic and behavioral variables on communication, problem-solving, theraputic, and learning outcomes. However, for this to be possible, there must be an exhibit of openess in the behavior research community. Such humanistic objectives like beliefs, feelings, attitudes, and personal meanings are centered inside people, and cannot be observably and quantatatively measured. Unless we use some form of inference, such matters will just have to be avoided. Of course, inference is generally regarded by many behavior professionals as being unscientific and unreliable. It should be

noted that the physical sciences have been using inferential techniques to deal with many unobservable problems. A further look into the physical sciences is warrented for further humanistic-behavioral research exploration.

There also must be a change in professional attitude among humanists and behaviorists. No longer should the issue of humanism vs. behaviorism take up so much time and importance in the professional community. Instead, the issue should be replaced by constructive thought of how to utilize humanistic and behavioral concepts and methodologies to help the client's needs.

It will also be important for the humanist-behaviorist to concentrate on efforts of engaging in practical research programs outside the domains of special education institutions, mental hospitals, prisons, and other isolated communities. The behaviorists have wrongly marketed behaviorism to imply deviant conditions for usage.

To sum this entire article, the author encourages the phrase "humanistic behaviorism" to be applied more in the professional community. This phrase of "humanistic behaviorism" should be interpreted as the practitioner's use of behavioral techniques and tools to reach humanistic goals. There is no doubt that all of the three shortcomings of professional development contributed to the slow acceptance of humanistic behaviorism. By training the individual and significant others to use self-modification skills, humanistic goals can be achieved by using behavioral tools. This is not a new concept and has been used for many years in the training of significant others (i.e., parents, siblings) of retarded and normal children (Johnson and Lobitz,1974), as well as the training of individuals to be their own therapists (Clement,1973). Humanistic behaviorism is slowly increasing popularity, even with it's long history of development.

REFERENCE

Brownlee, G., and King, B. Humanistic/Behavioristic Training Program For Teachers. Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, Nova University, 1975. (ED 103 392).

Carkhuff, R.R., and Berenson, B.G. Beyond Counseling and Therapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967.

Clement, P.W. Training children to be their own behavioral therapists. Journal of School Health, Dec. 1973, 43(10), 615-620.

Cohen, S., and Herah,R. Behaviorism and Humanism: A synthesis for teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1972, 23, 172-176.

Combs, A.W. Educational accountability from a humanistic perspective. Education Researcher, Sept. 1973, 2(9), 19-21.

Dolly, J.P. A Behavioral Approach In Defining and Teaching Educational Psychology. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., April 1975. (ED 104 819)

Dustin, R., and George, K. Action Counseling For Behavior Change. New York: Intext Educational Publishers, 1973.

_____. Educational Leader's Handbook For Humanizing and Individualizing Instruction. Cedar Knolls, N.J.:Educational Improvement Center of Northwest New Jersey, 1976.

Ellis, A. Reason and Emotion In Psychotherapy. Secaucus, N.J.: Lyle Stuart, Inc., 1973.

Fitt, S. Bridging the gap between Humanism and Behaviorism. The Elementary School Journal, Sept. 1976, 77, 13-17.

Frymier, J. Forward to Educational Accountability: Beyond Behavioral Objectives by A.W. Combs. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1972.

Haynes, F. Accountability and Serendipity. 1973. (ED 107 584)

Rogers, C.R., and Skinner, B.F. Some issues concerning the control of human behavior: A symposium. Science, 1956, 124, 1057-1066.

Skinner, B.F. Beyond Freedom and Dignity. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1971.

Skinner, B.F. Humanism and Behaviorism. The Humanist. July-Aug. 1972, 32(4), 18-20.

Steller, A. How To Achieve Accountability In An Open Humanistic School. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Elementary School Principals, Atlantic City, N.J., April 25, 1976. (ED 125 122)

Weaver, R.L.II. Humanistic Approach In Speech: Affective Behavioral Objectives. Paper presented at the 64th Annual Meeting of the Speech Association of the Eastern States, New York, March 9, 1973. (ED 078 471)

Woody, R.H. Psychobehavioral Counseling and Psychotherapy: Intergrating Behavioral and Insight Techniques. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971.

Hellison, D., and Siedentop, D. Humanism and Behaviorism In Physical Education; A Dialogue. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Anaheim, CA., March 1974.

Hosford, R.E., and Zimmer, J. Humanism through behaviorism. Counseling and Values, 1972, 16, 162-168.

Hunter, M. Humanism vs Behaviorism. Instructor, April 1977, 86, 98&.

Johnson, S.M., and Lobitz, G.K. Parental manipulation of child behavior in home observations. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1974, 7(1), 23-31.

Klein, M., Dittman, A.J., Parloff, M.P., and Gill, M.M. Behavior Therapy: Observations and reflections. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 259-266.

Linder, S. Getting Action In Your Lectures. A television cassette on file at Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida, 1976.

Linder, S. Individualizing Education: A Guide For Tutors. Commack, New York: Humanistic Educational Research Publications, 1974. (ED 104 430)

Linder, S. Retardation and Behavior Modification. Paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Certificate of Excellence in Psychology at C.W. Post College, 1973.

Linder, S. The Humanistic Interviewer. Commack, New York: Humanistic Educational Research Publications, 1975. (ED 117 591)

MacCorquodale, K. Behaviorism is a humanism. In F.W. Matson (ED.) Without/Within: Behaviorism and Humanism. Montery, CA.: Brooks/Cole, 1973.

Milhollan, F., and Forisha, B.E. From Skinner to Rogers. Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1972.

Odiorne, G. Management By Objectives. New York: Pitman Publishing Corp., 1965.